

Oxford Democrat.

VOLUME 2.

PARIS, MAINE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1835.

NUMBER 21

OXFORD DEMOCRAT,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY BY
GEORGE W. MILLER.

TERMS—One dollar and fifty cents in advance.—
One dollar and seventy-five cents at the end of six months.—
Two dollars at the end of the year.

No premium discounted till all dues are paid, but at the option of the publisher.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted on the usual terms; in any advertisement not being accountable for any amount in any advertisement beyond the amount charged for it.

COMMUNICATIONS, AND LETTERS ON BUSINESS MUST BE ADDRESSED TO THE PUBLISHER, POST-Paid.

THE BANK.

We invite the particular attention of our readers to the masterly letter of Secretary Woodbury in reply to one from Mr. Biddle in relation to the French bill. It is one of the severest castigations we recollect ever to have seen. Its severity is only equalled by its truth.

Succo Demo.

Treasury Department, }
December 12th, 1834. }

In obedience to a resolution of the House of Representatives, passed the 11th inst.

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to communicate to the House of Representatives, as soon as practicable, copies of the correspondence, not heretofore communicated, which has taken place between him and the President of the Bank of the United States, on the subject of the Branch Drafts, and in relation to the claim made by the Bank for damages, and the course pursued by that institution on account of the protest of the bill drawn on the French Government by the Treasury Department."

I have the honor to report, that the only correspondence on those subjects not heretofore communicated to Congress, which has taken place between the President of the Bank of the United States and this Department, consists on his part of two letters, one received on the 28th, and the other on the 30th ult.

That which related to the "damages and the course pursued by the Bank on account of the protest of the bill drawn on the French Government, being deemed of most public importance, has been answered, and copies of his letter, and the reply of this Department, are herewith communicated.

The other letter related to the late Circular from the Treasury, declining to receive the branch drafts in payment of the public dues after the close of the present year—and as it wished the department distinctly to "understand it is not at all against the measure itself, but only the reasons assigned for it, that any objection is made;" there did not seem to be much public necessity for hastening a reply. But as soon as the great pressure of the current business in this office may permit, one shall be completed, and copies of both transmitted to the House of Representatives.

LEVI WOODBURY,

Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. JOHN BELL,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Bank of the United States, }

Nov. 28th, 1834.

SIR: Your favor of the 13th of July last, reached the Bank during my absence, and finding on my return that my letter addressed to you at Washington, had been published in the newspapers of Nashville, it seemed useless to prolong a discussion which could only inflame the passions of the country in the midst of its elections. I have therefore foreborne to answer your letter until the time had passed for the repetition of a similar appeal from the laws.

The whole case appears to be exceedingly simple. There is a difference of opinion between the Treasury and the Bank about the damages on a bill of exchange. This is a matter of account which depends on the existing laws, and the acts of Congress provide specifically before what tribunal and in what manner the question must be tried. Thus by the act of the 3d of March, 1797, it is provided, that if any person, accountable for public money, fails to pay it, "it shall be the duty of the Comptroller, and he is hereby required to institute suit for the recovery of the same;" and in such suit "no claim for a credit shall be admitted upon trial, but such as shall appear to have been presented to the Accounting Officers of the Treasury for their examination" and by them disallowed in whole or in part. The Bank has accordingly presented its account for damages, which has been disallowed. It has then retained a sufficient amount of public money for the purpose, and invited a suit by the Treasury so as to bring the subject before the court. It did this and so stated it, "as the best if not the only mode" of settling the question. But as the money itself was an object of indifference to the Bank, which sought only to vindicate its own rights, and the retaining of it was a mere form, to comply with the act of Congress, the Bank at the same time requested from the Secretary to know, whether there was "any other mode of submitting the rights of the respective parties to the judicial tribunals more acceptable" to him—and would instantly have released the money on any arrangement with the Treasury to bring the case before the courts.

There is a still more summary process of obtaining a decision. By the act of Congress

of May 15th, 1820, if the public money be withheld, the first Comptroller of the Treasury has found to be so extraordinary in their tone, in their allusions, and assertions, that, unpleasant as the task is, this Department has, under all the circumstances, felt constrained to submit such remarks in relation to them as are deemed appropriate, and seem imperative to be required. The Bank may therefore, sir, rest assured, that though your letter arrived so late as to prevent the submission of it to the President, before preparing his annual message, or to the Attorney General before his opinion was requested on the case, and as to deprive the undersigned of offering any comment in his report to Congress concerning this subject, yet, in relation to the affairs of which it treats, an "appeal" from the laws, has never, as you appear to intimate, been made by this department, nor is one in contemplation. Any such "appeal" is left to those who, without the sanction of an appropriation by Congress, or without a legal precept, seize upon public property, and convert it to their own private emoluments. But, after a violation of the rights of the United States, and a diversion of its revenue from the Treasury and the public service, into the vaults of the Bank, if the latter expects that the Chief Executive Magistrate of the Union, or the Secretary of the Treasury, will be silent, and not communicate early and full information concerning the outrage to the People and their Representatives—and that those public officers are to be deterred from this discharge of a solemn duty, because the Bank entertains an opinion, that such a course is an "appeal from the laws," you have yet to learn, that both the character of that Chief Magistrate and the obligations of duty entertained by this Department, have been greatly misapprehended.

3. That of the money so paid by the Bank, the whole was immediately appropriated by the Treasury, and a part used in the current expenses of the Government.

4. That when the bill was protested in Paris, as was inevitable, and the money paid by the agents of the Bank, to save the credit of the Treasury, the claim of damages by the Bank was an indispensable act of duty, as that alone would enable the Treasury to claim damages from the French Government, which, if the Treasury had any right to draw at all, was as much due as the principal.

5. That the universal and inflexible rule of the Treasury is to make every one pay damages; and as it had required of the Stockholders of the Bank to pay damages, when their bills sold to the Treasury have been protested, so should it now pay damages to those stockholders, when they in turn have bought a bill from the Treasury which becomes protested.

All this will be made manifest whenever the Treasury resorts to the proper tribunal. Until then, it seems unjust to prejudge the question, and quite fruitless to discuss it.

I have the honor to be,
very respectfully yours,

(Signed) N. BIDDLE, President.
Hon. LEVI WOODBURY,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Treasury Department, }
Dec. 11th, 1834. }

SIR: Your communication of the 28th ult., acknowledging the receipt of my letter of the 13th of July last, relative to the detention of the public dividends by the Bank of the United States, was duly received.

After a silence of more than four months, coupled with the hostile position the Bank had assumed, it was supposed that you did not contemplate entering into further correspondence in respect to this subject, and especially as it was supposed, that a correspondence would not be resumed, with an avowed view to any explanations or new arrangements, at so late a period, that your communication could not reach this department till the day previous to that session of Congress to which you had been early apprised a report would be made on the whole proceedings of the Bank in this extraordinary transaction.

Presuming, therefore, that the Bank ought to have felt all the reluctance expressed in your letter, "to prolong a discussion" on that transaction, which cannot but be admitted, from its unprincipled and unjustifiable character, was well calculated to "inflame the passions of the country," and that this circumstance might naturally have led to the postponement of a reply till after the elections; yet no reason is assigned in your explanation, whatever may be the reason conjectured by others, for the failure to forward that reply immediately after the popular elections had terminated, and in season for a suitable examination of its contents before Congress convened.

But it would be unjust to the Bank not to return thanks for the very considerate sentiment expressed in your apology for the first delay, wish not "to prolong a discussion" which would only inflame the passions of the country in the midst of its elections." This Department regrets that so powerful a corporation—though perhaps unable to restrain, and therefore not responsible for the Harrangues of some of its advocates, on whatever days, places, or occasions—had not in its own resolutions, reports of committees, and essays and pamphlets, published by its President, under a vote "to cause to be prepared and circulated such documents and papers as may communicate to the people information in regard to the nature and operations of the Bank"—earlier used a little more effort to practice the same liberality as being in your opinion "the best, if not the only course of settling the question." You state further, that this has been done by the Bank only "to vindicate its own rights," when no case is believed to exist when a person not receiving money as an officer or contractor of the Government, or money not previously granted by Congress under some special or general appropriation, (in which mode the Bank did not receive these dividends) has ever been able to "vindicate" its supposed "rights" by returning the money to meet any claims, however great the loss to the Bank, in consequence of the application by the Bank for relief in this

case, "had never been presented to Congress, and refused so as to furnish the slightest apology for being obliged in order to procure redress, to resort to this unusual remedy."

But if the views of the Department on this proceeding be erroneous, much gratification

would be derived from having the particular act and clause quoted by the Bank, on which it relies in making the assertion, that "the retaining of this money was a mere form to comply with the act of Congress." This Department has not been so fortunate as to discover any statute, and much less the one cited of March 3d, 1797, which requires of a claimant against the Government, that he should, in a controverged case seize its property in order "to comply with the act of Congress;" nor any statute which authorizes, recognizes, or palliates such a seizure, in order to force the Government into a law suit, and thus, through the agency of the judiciary, attempt to effect the payment of doubtful claims; to which no money has been appropriated nor legislative sanction given.

The proposition of the Bank to make some arrangement to have this question brought before the Courts, and the assurance now given, that, in such an event, it "would immediately have released the money," would have deserved

much more attention, and stronger confidence, had this assurance been more promptly given, and that amicable disposition, now manifested, been earlier evinced by the Bank, in having at least requested such an arrangement before the dividends were withheld.

Before committing that aggression, the Bank was not pleased even to notify the Treasury that it wished the question of damages settled by litigation and it communicated not the slightest intimation of a desire to make any "arrangement with the Treasury to bring the case before the Courts." But the Bank having, on these points preserved perfect silence, and the Department and Congress having been thus lulled into security till after the adjournment of the latter, than suddenly and without previous notice, a portion of the accruing revenue, estimated and expected to aid in meeting the large appropriations which had just been made, and to pay the residue of the public debt, was withheld by the Bank and was not offered to be restored till after the termination of a suit, probably protracted for many years.

After committing that aggression, and still withholding in its possession the money of the United States, the Bank then, and not till then, "invited" this Department to bring the subject of the damages in some way before the courts, and thus indirectly to sanction the appeal of the Bank from the authority of Congress over this matter, and to acquiesce, till adjusted by litigation, in the Bank's unprecedented and ruinous course as the public revenue—a course involving a principle which, under all the circumstances of this case, if once adopted, might disorganize our whole collections, by the seizure of them, without legal precept, under one pretence or another, and, as previously explained, place even our disbursements, so far as the public funds consist of United States Bank notes, at the sole mercy of an irritated and unscrupulous corporation. But this Department could not sanction, however urgently "invited," without proving faultless to every principle of public duty and public safety.

Late as even that invitation, it is remarkable that your letters expressed nothing about the money itself "being an object of indifference to the Bank," or that it "would instantly have released the money in any arrangement with the Treasury to bring the case before the courts."

Besides all the decisive reasons against the reprehensible conduct of the Bank in this transaction, which are contained in the late Message of the President and in the opinion of the Attorney General, the Bank, if it possesses, as has been intimated, another controverted claim against the United States, for the removal of the public deposits, in magnificence, is

order to discharge it, or alone for any other object, yet it is difficult to discover "what rights" the Bank then sought to " vindicate," except its rights to the money, and why it should be so tenacious of its rights to the money itself.

On the contrary, though some persons may for a time have apprehended from certain circumstances, that "money was an object of indifference to the Bank" in comparison with some other objects, yet it is difficult to discover "what rights" the Bank then sought to " vindicate," except its rights to the money, and why it should be so tenacious of its rights to the money itself.

By your correspondence at that time, the money appears to have been withheld with the express view to force the Department into a

consent to pay the controverted damages claimed, without any sanction by Congress, or into some arrangement to submit to the judiciary for decision, a question which, under the constitution and circumstances of the case, belongs to Congress alone, and, after that decision, and not till then, if unfavorable, to make a restoration of the dividends, the Bank had so unexpectedly seized, in derogation of the laws.

It was not until the time had passed for the repetition of a similar appeal from the laws by the Bank to cover its other intimated claims for damages, on account of the removal of the depositories, with any probable hope of public approbation in favor of its new mode of aiding the fiscal operations of the Government, and not till after those elections to which you refer, may, in your opinion, have terminated so disastrously to its hopes, that the Bank professed a perfect "indifference" about the money, and a willingness to release it, in case an arrangement was effected for a suit at law.

How a suit could still proceed, and the money be first released or repaid, must be left to the Bank for further explanation, as it is incomprehensible to this Department, unless affected through some fictitious case, to be agreed on in order to deprive Congress of its constitutional

power over appropriations to settle contested claims against the United States, and which agreement, you may rest assured, that this Department has as little inclination as it has legitimate power to make.

It may be proper then to state further and distinctly, that the submission of the whole case to the wisdom and authority of Congress, appears to the Treasury to be the only suitable course, and that it cannot enter into any arrangement in relation to the subject, except to receive, as requested in its communication to the Bank in July last, the dividends due to the United States, and to refer the Bank, as is done with other claimants in similar cases, to the justice of Congress for any damages demanded on the bill of exchange beyond the actual expenses and costs incurred. The acknowledgments of this Department should not be omitted for your kindness in pointing out more than one mode that might be pursued in the Courts of law against the Bank; but, as the advice of an opposing party is not always safest, and as Congress is competent to give directions upon the claim of the United States, and is considered the proper tribunal for adjusting the claim of the Bank, your benevolent suggestions will, it is feared, prove unavailing; especially, since the summary process to which you now allude, besides being open to other objections, is in express terms and by a decision of the Courts, applicable to the case only of debtors, who, unlike the Bank in this instance, obtain possession of the public money, in their capacity of public officers. What may be the design now in making, "for obtaining a decision," a proposition which would doubtless fail if accepted, is best known to yourself; and such "distinguished" counsel of the Bank as you cite to this Department, in your other published letter of the 26th ult. It must be admitted that the Bank, in the next place, evinces great frankness in proceeding to disclose, under five separate specifications, what it expects to prove on trial. Whether there is much likelihood that this expectation will ever be realized, others must decide; but the ingenuity in stating beforehand to the opposite party what is to be proved against him, should not pass without due commendation, though it is regretted, that under all the circumstances, a suspicion—it may be an unjust one—has arisen, that the statement was made rather with a view to be immediately laid before the community by the Bank, either to "inflame the passions" or to "forestill public opinion on these points before a reply was received from this Department.

In laying down the first position which the Bank asserts it "will always be ready to prove," viz: "that the Bill of Exchange on the French Government was drawn without the slightest authority," it is

fear, that the zeal of the Bank, to vindicate a foreign treaty, in which that Government expressly

stipulates to pay "the sum of twenty-five millions of francs, at Paris, in six annual instalments,

of four millions one hundred and sixty thousand

six hundred and sixty six centimes each, into the hand of such person or persons as shall be authorized by the Government of the United States to receive it."

The Bank appears, moreover, to have forgotten the written authority, under seal from the President of the United States, which accompanied the bill, and empowered the holder as the person designated under the money itself "being an object of indifference to the Bank," or that it "would instantly have released the money in any arrangement with the Treasury to bring the case before the courts."

Late as even that invitation, it is remarkable that your letters expressed nothing about the money itself "being an object of indifference to the Bank," or that it "would instantly have released the money in any arrangement with the Treasury to bring the case before the courts."

By your correspondence at that time, the money appears to have been withheld with the express view to force the Department into a

consent to pay the controverted damages claimed, without any sanction by Congress, or into some arrangement to submit to the judiciary for decision, a question which, under the constitution and circumstances of the case, belongs to Congress alone, and, after that decision, and not till then, if unfavorable, to make a restoration of the dividends, the Bank had so unexpectedly seized, in derogation of the laws.

It was not until the time had passed for the repetition of a similar appeal from the laws by the Bank to cover its other intimated claims for damages, on account of the removal of the depositories, with any probable hope of public approbation in favor of its new mode of aiding the fiscal operations of the Government, and not till after those elections to which you refer, may, in your opinion, have terminated so disastrously to its hopes, that the Bank professed a perfect "indifference" about the money, and a willingness to release it, in case an arrangement was effected for a suit at law.

How a suit could still proceed, and the money be first released or repaid, must be left to the Bank for further explanation, as it is incomprehensible to this Department, unless affected through some fictitious case, to be agreed on in order to deprive Congress of its constitutional

power over appropriations to settle contested claims against the United States, and which agreement, you may rest assured, that this Department has as little inclination as it has legitimate power to make.

It may be proper then to state further and distinctly, that the submission of the whole case to the wisdom and authority of Congress, appears to the Treasury to be the only suitable course, and that it cannot enter into any arrangement in relation to the subject, except to receive, as requested in its communication to the Bank in July last, the dividends due to the United States, and to refer the Bank, as is done with other claimants in similar cases, to the justice of Congress for any damages demanded on the bill of exchange beyond the actual expenses and costs incurred. The acknowledgments of this Department should not be omitted for your kindness in pointing out more than one mode that might be pursued in the Courts of law against the Bank; but, as the advice of an opposing party is not always safest, and as Congress is competent to give directions upon the claim of the United States, and is considered the proper tribunal for adjusting the claim of the Bank, your benevolent suggestions will, it is feared, prove unavailing; especially, since the summary process to which you now allude, besides being open to other objections, is in express terms and by a decision of the Courts, applicable to the case only of debtors, who, unlike the Bank in this instance, obtain possession of the public money, in their capacity of public officers. What may be the design now in making, "for obtaining a decision," a proposition which would doubtless fail if accepted, is best known to yourself; and such "distinguished" counsel of the Bank as you cite to this Department, in your other published letter of the 26th ult. It must be admitted that the Bank, in the next place, evinces great frankness in proceeding to disclose, under five separate specifications, what it expects to prove on trial. Whether there is much likelihood that this expectation will ever be realized, others must decide; but the ingenuity in stating beforehand to the opposite party what is to be proved against him, should not pass without due commendation, though it is regretted, that under all the circumstances, a suspicion—it may be an unjust one—has arisen, that the statement was made rather with a view to be immediately laid before the community by the Bank, either to "inflame the passions" or to "forestill public opinion on these points before a reply was received from this Department.

In laying down the first position which the Bank asserts it "will always be ready to prove," viz: "that the Bill of Exchange on the French Government was drawn without the slightest authority," it is

fear, that the zeal of the Bank, to vindicate a foreign treaty, in which that Government expressly

stipulates to pay "the sum of twenty-five millions of francs, at Paris, in six annual instalments,

of four millions one hundred and sixty thousand

six hundred and

pressed by the Bank, to accommodate the amount, the moment notice was given of the Treasury, and the "indifference" the Bank now portend of the bill.

In regard to the practice which you cite of some, that pursuing the before mentioned course, it must have meditated originally a speculation as to the protest and expected damages.

What seems at first rather inexplicable, is, that the Bank, knowing, and being ready to prove that this Department drew the bill, without slightest authority," and hence could not require France to pay any damages, if the bill was protested—should yet insist, that the claims of damages by the Bank, was "an indispensable act of duty, to enable the Treasury to claim damages of the French Government." This great kindness towards the Government of your own country, unfeigned and voluntarily to seize on its revenue, and attempt to plunge it into a lawsuit at home, and a controversy abroad, to enable it to obtain large damages of another country, which it must, if obtained immediately pay over to the Bank, certainly deserves all due acknowledgment. In fine, while the Bank is professing to give all this friendly advice for the benefit of the Treasury, and feel, itself, a great indifference about the money," its regard for the Treasury upon this particular subject, seems, when stripped of all blandishments, to consist in urging the Government to demand, and to hazard a new quarrel with France, to obtain, large and vindicate damages, by asserting that they are as much due "as the principal" when in fact the United States are entitled from France to only the reasonable and actual damages sustained, and when large and vindicative ones are to be sought in behalf, not of the Treasury, but of the disinterested institution which is urging this indefensible measure; and when, if such aggravated damages are obtained, they are expected to go at once, and exclusively, not into the Treasury, but into the vaults of the Bank; or, which is virtually the same to supply the place of the great amount of public revenue the Bank has already on this account seized and withheld;

But notwithstanding this, if now, or at any other period, the Bank shall, as alleged, be ready to prove that "the money was paid by the agents of the Bank to save the credit of the Treasury," the favor will be cheerfully acknowledged by this Department, as in that event no right in the Bank to the aggravated damages claimed against the Treasury, and which had led to the outrage of seizing on the public dividends, could well be pretended to exist. It is hoped, as you profess to consider that "the claim of damages by the Bank was an indispensable act of duty," you will also not hesitate to perform another equally "indispensable act of duty," by furnishing, as early as practicable, the evidence to prove the point just mentioned; since if such evidence is furnished, not only should the aggravated damages be relinquished, but the conduct of those agents of the Bank in that particular, be duly appreciated.

In that event, they of course, did not pay the money for "the credit of the Treasury" for the purpose of exacting from it, on account of the professed favor, the large constructive damages of \$150,000 or \$170,000, but, it must be presumed, they paid it with a view to save the Treasury from exposure to such a claim by some foreigner who might be heartless or sordid, and whose pecuniary profit being alone concerned, might be so destitute of patriotic feelings for this country, as to permit the bill not only to be protested abroad, and the "credit of the Treasury" so suffer, as to have it returned home protested, but who might thereupon immediately make a demand on the Treasury beyond the actual damages and costs sustained and even for great, and it may be properly added, penal damages, and to pursue this demand in so inexorable a spirit as not to wait for the decision of Congress upon it, but, without legal precept or any previous notice of his design, to seize upon a large amount of the public revenue, for the purpose of discharging it.

In relation to your third head of proof, "that of the money so paid by the Bank, the whole was immediately appropriated by the Treasury and a part used in the current expenses of the Government," it gives me pleasure to attempt a correction thus early of these misapprehensions.

This Department has, in the reports sent here monthly by the direction of the President of the Bank, statements, which show that the amount standing to the credit of the public in the Bank, which of course includes its branches, was at no time after the purchase of the French Bill on the 11th of February, 1833, until the formal return of the money to the Bank on the 10th of May, 1833, less than eight millions of dollars. That of this at no time, was less than four millions left in the Bank and its branches, to the credit of the Treasurer, subject to draft for any purpose, and that the residuum was deposited on account of the public debt, and of the public collecting and disbursing officers. So that whatever sum of money may have been "appropriated by the Treasury" or "used" between those periods, it still left in the vaults of the Bank and in its use, standing to credit of the Treasurer, at the times of all your intervening returns, a sum from three to four millions beyond the amount of the bill, or from three to four times more than the amount which you had, in form only, paid to the Treasury, or passed to its credit, in trust for the numerous sufferers by French spoliations. And no part of the sum received on the bill was ever so "appropriated" or "used" by the Treasury as to be carried into it by warrant; or it could not, until Congress should have passed a new law, have refunded, at its aid, the whole

A new French Ministry has been formed, with the Duke de Trevis (Marshal Mortier) as you, a denial on the part of the National Intelligencer of the truth of the rumor of a misunderstanding or disagreement existing in the Cabinet as it existed previous to the appointment of the Duke of Bassano.

It is stated in a Liverpool paper, that on the news of the formation of the Bassano Ministry reaching Talleyrand, he immediately sent in his resignation as Ambassador to the Court of London.

There is no news of importance either from Spain or Portugal.

The plague continues its ravages at Constantinople.

EXCITEMENT IN ENGLAND.

England appears to have been thrown into a state of great agitation, by the appointment of the Duke of Wellington to the office of Prime Minister. Meantime we hear of all the populous cities of the kingdom, to express their dissatisfaction at the new state of affairs. The different parties in the opposition appear to unite in very violent proceedings. One of the latest London papers says:—"The most gratifying features in to-day's occurrences were the perfect unanimity of all classes and sections of reformers against either the threats or the bribes of a Tory Government. Radicals, ultra Radicals, and Whigs, were everywhere to be seen acting together, and wisely casting aside all minor dissensions, in order to oppose a united front to their common enemy." The same paper remarks,—"The most perfect unanimity prevails amongst all classes of reformers throughout the Kingdom. From Kent, Devon, Somersetshire, Gloucestershire, Dorsetshire, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire, Notts, and in short almost all the counties in England, we have the strongest assurances that the metropolis does not stand alone in the indignation and disgust with which it views the Tory intrigue. In Scotland and Ireland we have also various accounts that the best possible feeling prevails. All minor differences are laid aside, and the nation stands united as one man."

THE NEW FRENCH MINISTRY.

London, Nov. 22. The papers of the 19th have reached us, and at length we receive the official announcement of the New Ministry.—The following appointments appeared in a Royal Ordinance published in the Moniteur of that day:

President of the Council and Minister of War the Duke of Trevis (Marshal Mortier).

Minister of Interior, M Thiers; of Foreign Affairs, Admiral de Rigny; of Public Instruction, M Guizot; of Commerce, M Duchatel; of Justice, M Persil; of Finance, H. Human.

From the above list it will be seen that the Cabinet is in fact a restoration of the old Ministry, with substitution of the Duke of Trevis for M Gerard.

THE NEW ENGLISH MINISTRY.

The following is believed to be the New Ministry, as formed by the Duke of Wellington:—Lord Lyndhurst, will be Lord Chancellor; Sir James Scarlet, Lord Chief Baron (with a Peership); Sir Charles M. Sutton, Home Secretary; Sir Robert Peel, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Leader of the House of Commons; Lord Ellenborough, Foreign Secretary; Marquis of Chaudes, First Lord of the Admiralty; Lord Cowley, President of the Board of Control; Earl of Rosslyn, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; Earl of Aberdeen, Ambassador to France; Lord Stuart de Ralbyay or Lord Munster, Governor General of India; Lord Maryborough, Master of the Horse; Sir Edward Sugden, Attorney General; Mr. Follett or Mr. Pollock, Solicitor General.

FOREIGN NEWS.

From the Boston Commercial Gazette,
LATE AND IMPORTANT FROM EUROPE.

By the packetship George Washington, Capt. Holdridge, the New York Editors have received London papers to Nov. 23d, and Liverpool to the 24th, both inclusive.

The news is important, both politically and commercially. Since the date of our previous advices, there had been a rise in cotton, amounting to full three farthings per pound. The announcement of the appointment of Lord Wellington as Premier, and the change in the Ministry, had produced the utmost excitement throughout the country, and meetings have been called in every direction to take strong measures in regard to it. The dissolution of the late Ministry appears to have originated entirely with the King, as it is confidently asserted that Lord Melbourne and his colleagues were prepared to remain in office, and to propose a statesman for the King's approval to fill the situation of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Lord Wellington appears to experience much difficulty in forming a new Cabinet, as more than a week has elapsed from the time of his appointment to the date of our last advices, without his having done so.

It is proposed in some of the London and other Journals to revive the Political Unions, and a tremendous and overwhelming opposition appears to be forming in London, Glasgow, Dublin, and other places, against the contemplated administration.

The British Parliament has been further prorogued from the 25th of November to the 18th of December. Mr. Brougham, the late Lord Chancellor gave up his seals of office on the 21st, after finished the business before him. He stated to the bar, that no power on earth should induce him to remain in office any longer under the present circumstances. The London *Times*, which by the way, has joined the new Tory party, declares that the Queen had not the slightest concern in bringing about the revolution in the cabinet.

The passage of this bill is loudly called for, but it has an unfortunate foster-father, Mr. Wat-

erough, which has called down upon it more opposition than it deserves. I think the bill will pass, however, in a modified shape.

be eventually rewarded by an elevation to that chair which has been adorned by a Washington, a Jefferson, a Madison and a Jackson.

Resolved, That in a National Convention for the selection of candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, we recognize the only Democratic method of preserving the election of those high officers to the people, and that we cheerfully submit to the decision of that Democratic body

The correspondent of the Boston Post, at Washington, writes that Judge Philip P. Barbour of Virginia, had consented to become a candidate for a seat in the Senate, and that it had not been ascertained that he would be elected by a majority of four or five votes over Mr. Leigh.

State Papers. Our table is so much crowded with public documents and important State papers, that we scarcely know where to begin with or how to dispose of them. The interesting and able report of the Secretary of the Treasury we have been obliged to publish in a condensed form, and the War Report is given in a paragraph. The correspondence between Mr. Woodbury and President Biddle on the subject of the Bank's seizure of the government dividends we intend to publish next week. Of this correspondence the editor of the Richmond Enquirer speaks as follows:

N. H. Patriot.

Mr. Woodbury's Letter.—We recommend the correspondence between the Secretary of the United States Bank and the Secretary of the Treasury, to the particular attention of the reader. We have scarcely ever perused so scathing a letter, as Mr. Woodbury's reply. The facts which he states, are conclusive—the arguments powerful—but the satire, with which they are conveyed is tremendously severe. We did not think it was in the *Secretary*. We should never have suspected it, from what we knew of the character of his mind. He has strip off all the disguises of the Bank—and the *confiscation* of the public treasures, which it has attempted, now stands out as one of the most unjustifiable abuses of this arrogant corporation.

MR. POINDEXTER.

Mr. Poindexter, when making speeches in this section of this country, denied in the most unequivocal manner, the charge which has been made against him of his having basely fled from the standard of his country on the 8th January, 1815. He said it was a lie—that where danger was, there was he. We have been repeatedly told, by men who occupied conspicuous stations in the army on the 8th of January, that Mr. Poindexter did run from the battle ground, on the morning of the 8th, at the very commencement of the fight.—Col. Campbell was there, and his valuable services have often been spoken of in terms of high commendation. He is better acquainted with Poindexter's history than any man in the State, and saw him running. At a dinner given to Robert J. Walker, on the 1st instant, at Port Gibson, Colonel Campbell gave the following toast:

By Col. A. Campbell, an invited guest, from Adams county. George Poindexter, the coward whom I saw falloping from the standard of his country while the battle was raging on the morning of the battle of the 8th of January, 1815—ought not to be trusted with her rights.—Mississippian.

Federal White-washing.—On Thursday the 18th inst. the Finance Committee of the U. S. Senate made a Report of their investigation of the affairs of the Bank, which consumed upwards of three hours in the reading, and which exonerates the Bank from most of the charges which have been made against it by the friends of the Administration. It will be remembered that this committee was composed exclusively of opposition members of the Senate, and the consequences has been, as they say it in their Report, that the Bank have allowed them a free and complete examination of all its Books —those which were refused to the Committee of the House of Representatives were cheerfully laid before that of the Senate; and this Committee, as in duty bound, have pronounced the Bank to be honest and pure.

As soon as the reading of the Report was concluded Mr. Benton took the floor, and in one of the most spirited Speeches ever delivered in the Halls of Congress, he exposed the falsehoods and fallacies contained in the Report in a manner which threw the Bankites into the greatest confusion—in vain they attempted to escape the lash by turning his remarks to ridicule, but it would not answer—every sentiment he uttered was so properly applied that escape was impossible, and the white washing can have no other effect than to increase public sentiment against the Bank, and sink still deeper the debased characters of its servile advocates. We shall publish Mr. Benton's speech the first opportunity we have.

Dover Gazette.

A Dilemma. The Whigs not unfrequently find themselves placed in rather ridiculous positions in consequence of their almost innumerable changes of name. A Whig Convention was recently held in one of the Western States, near the close of which a discussion arose as to the name by which the next convention should be called. This was somewhat of a puzzle to them. But the difficulty was finally settled by authorizing the Secretary to call the next year's convention "by such name as the whig party shall then be known by." The whigs are very fond of trying "experiments" in this line, but they have thus far been wholly disappointed in their results.—[*The Age*.

Art. Connell History Life of ton Schleipen's Posthumous Gen. B. Fac. 11. P. Art. 1—

OXFORD DEMOCRAT.
PARIS, JANUARY 6, 1836.

A large portion of this day's paper is occupied with the correspondence between the President of the U. S. Bank and the Secretary of the Treasury. Though our opponents tell us occasionally that the Bank is dead—that they have no connection with it, and that they are not its supporters, yet we find them on all occasions ready to justify every act and usurpation of this institution—to trumpet forth its praises, and to lament in most pathetic terms the hardships it has endured in not being permitted to rule the country untrammeled and uncontrollable. They were in ecstasies when they got Mr. Biddle's letter to the Treasury, and they rejoiced at it as a deadly home stroke, in the contest which he has waged with the present administration. The Secretary's reply came upon them like a cold bath in December. They have carefully kept it from their readers lest their faith in the money king should be shaken by such an exposure of his misconduct. Notwithstanding the length of this letter we recommend it to the attentive perusal of our readers as well deserving of their attention. The outrageous conduct of the Bank fully justifies the severity of remark in which the writer indulges himself, and the fact that Biddle's letter was published in the Bank paper before it reached the Secretary, demanded from him the attention which it has received.

North Eastern Boundary. Our readers doubtless recollect that the President, in his late message, informed us that this question so interesting to us, was still under negotiation, and that hopes were entertained of a favorable result. We naturally felt a deep interest in this question and in all that relates to it. It is not surprising that the people of this State should feel impatience at the slow progress of the pending negotiation on this subject, but it may perhaps be difficult to hasten it. A call has recently been made in the House of Representatives by Mr. Lincoln of Massachusetts, for information to be communicated by the President on this matter. The President will doubtless take care if the resolutions are passed, that neither the interests of this State, nor of the United States, are compromised by improper disclosures. Whatever is not incompatible with public interest will doubtless be disclosed, though we do not think it will turn out to be of much interest or importance. A second branch of the inquiry proposed is as to the actual jurisdiction exercised on the disputed territory. The motives for this enquiry are not very apparent, nor did the gentleman who moved the enquiry choose to disclose them. We know not what interest Massachusetts has in this question of jurisdiction, unless it arises from that desire of exercising a kind of political guardianship over us, which she has always manifested. We trust that our Representatives are able and willing to protect our rights and honor—our territory and jurisdiction without the assistance of Massachusetts' politicians, who would gladly sacrifice one half of our State to subserve the interests of a party. If she chooses to render us assistance in this business when it is needed, it will be received with all the gratitude which it may deserve, but we do not conceive that having asked her co-operation, entitles her to assume a guardianship over us, and to take the whole business into her own hands, and manage it without even consulting the wishes and feelings of those.

BANK REPORT. Just before the close of the last session of Congress, the Senate appointed a committee of friends of the Bank to examine the proceedings of that institution, and to report whether they had violated their charter, or in any way misconducted themselves. This committee was composed of men who had justified and defended the Bank in all its proceedings, and who, as politicians, depended upon it for assistance and support. Many of them had received large accommodations from the Bank, and some had long been retained as its attorneys. Under these circumstances a report might just as well have been asked from the President of the Bank himself. The appointment of this committee was considered a mockery of justice and an insult to the community who had suffered so much from the operations of the Bank. We have not seen the Report which has been made, but from the accounts given of it by its friends, the committee have realized the worst expectations that had been entertained of the manner in which they would discharge their duties. The report is lauded by the Bank papers as a complete justification of the whole conduct of the Bank, indeed, judging from what its friends say of it, it is a long and labored defense of that most corrupt institution. This we presume is to be offered to the public as a reply to the facts which can neither be disputed or denied, and about which there can be but one opinion among the unprejudiced. This white-washing report will not satisfy the public of the purity of the Bank, nor of the honesty and impartiality of those who made it. The committee say that the Bank afforded them every facility for a full investigation of all its affairs. Why did they not, if conscious of innocence, afford equal facilities to the Committee of the House, who were appointed to that service last year? Was it because that committee did not consist entirely of friends and dependents? It is well for the country that the days of this institution are numbered, and that its means of doing mischief are gradually lessening.

Quarterly Reviews. We have received the August number of the London Quarterly Review, being one of a series, the whole of which comprises the London, Edinburgh, Foreign and Westminster Quarterly Reviews, republished by Theodore Foster of New York. Price for the whole series \$8 per annum. We need say nothing of the value of these works to those who are acquainted with them. They are filled by the best writers in England, and are undoubtedly the most valuable and interesting periodicals in Europe. The literary and scientific information which they contain would be useful for all who have a taste for reading or a thirst for knowledge. The cost of these works when imported is \$32. The republication is handsomely and neatly done. The low price at which they are offered places them within the reach of almost all who have a fondness for reading. We recommend them to our readers as really deserving of their patronage. Carpenter of Augusta, and Colman & Chisholm of Portland, are Agents for the work. The following are the contents of the number received by us:

Art. 1. Coleridge's Poetical Works. 2.—Connolly's Overland Journey to India. 3.—History of Roman Literature. 4. Campbell's Life of Mrs. Siddons. 5. Mischief. 6. Eton School—Education in England. 7. Napoleon's Letters to Josephine. 8. Crabbe's Posthumous Tales. 9. Belgium and Western Germany, by Mrs. Trollope and Sir A. B. Faulkner. 10. The New Poor Laws. 11. Present State of France. 12. Note on Art. 1—Death of Mr. Coleridge.

Fiendish Murder.—Perhaps no case in the annals of crime surpasses that which we are now about to record, for cold blooded and atrocious barbarity.

Immediately back of the Arsenal, and a few steps from the public highway, stands a log house, built and occupied by an old man of the name of Windham, a gardener and an attendant upon the St. Louis Market. A daughter, seventeen or eighteen years of age, was with her father, the only inmates of the house,—her mother being dead. Early on Sunday morning last, the attent of a citizen, who happened to be passing, was attracted to this house by an appearance of fire issuing from it. Upon opening the door,—he found the room filled with a dense smoke reverberating every thing inside imperceptible, and perfect silence all around. He immediately procured a bucket of water, and threw it in the quarter where he supposed the fire to be ; but a voice from the bed directed his efforts to the "chest." This he at last found picked it up threw it out of doors, and then extinguished the fire. He next proceeded to kindle a blaze on the heart, and having done so—a scene of horror presented itself to his view. Upon the floor, by his side lay the dead body of Miss Windham, but on the bed the mangled and almost lifeless body of her farther. Clots of blood were discovered in every part of the room—the floor was filled with half consumed papers, taken from the chest, and every thing was in confusion. The investigations in the course of the day brought to light no evidence having the least tendency to criminate any one. It was in testimony, that two distinct reports of a gun were heard about 12 or 1 o'clock at night ; and the old man thinks it was shortly after they went to bed, that they were attacked. A noise being made at the door, the daughter got up with the intention of opening it. It is supposed, that the fire afforded light enough to give the miscreants a distinct view of her person, and they fired at her through the window, breaking the pane of glass. The entire load of buck shot entered the side of her neck, and she must have fallen dead. The murderers then turned the gun upon the farther, who was still in bed. The discharge took effect in his face, one shot passed through the eye to the brain.—Life not being extinct, they attacked him with an axe or some sharp weapon, and gave him several severe blows on the head. They then proceeded to rife the house ; broke open the chest took the money, if there was any ; and then, to leave no tell-tale of their butchery, threw a coal of fire into the chest, and closed the lid. The plot as is seen, was almost consummated ; a few minutes more and every thing would have been burnt up.

Surgical aid was procured as soon as possible for the old man—several operations performed, and one of the shot extracted from the brain. He was taken to the hospital, where he yet lingered last evening. The old man does not appear to recover any thing distinctly. He says, however, that a Dutchman, who boarded at a house at or near the Arsenal, was the only visitor on the previous evening. This man he describes as being tall and having large black whiskers. It is said, that this individual was met on Sunday morning, near the spot, with a gun ; and or being requested to assist in putting out the fire, declined doing so, and proceeded to Jefferson Barracks.

These unfortunate persons had resided where they were attacked for about three years and in the country of ten or twelve. Mr. Windham was a Scotchman ; he or his daughter attended market with great regularity ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in Westchester County. Her daughter was a good looking young woman, about twenty-eight years of age, who had previously sustained an unblemished reputation ; and it is thought that as he was a prudent thrifty man, he had laid by some money.

St. Louis Republican, Nov. 25

Heavy Damages. An action was lately decided in New York, Elizabeth Park vs. Hezekiah Lyon ; which was brought to recover damages for the seduction, under promise of marriage, of her daughter Dorcas W. Park. The plaintiff was a widow of respectability residing near Rye, in

From the Pennsylvania.

THE ACQUITTAL OF BUZZELL.
The Boston Transcript, in speaking of the acquittal of Buzzell, said to be the ring leader of the Convent Rioters, says, under the significant caption of "How it was done?"

"We learn that when the jury in the case of Buzzell, retired to their room after the charge of the Judge, they were seven for conviction and five for acquittal. On Friday morning, before they left their room, they were ten for acquittal and two for conviction; but on the way from their room to the court house, the two suddenly changed their minds, and agreed to acquit. This beats a jury's marking all round for damages, and then taking the average!"

"These Charlestown trials will we suspect, reflect, a greater disgrace upon our country than the Charleston riot, arson, and murder. So far at least the proceedings are regarded and spoken of by all intelligent persons, beyond the influence of the Charlestown mob, as a bitter mockery of justice, and a mere farce. It would be better to proclaim an immunity to all like offenders, that the laws may not be looked to as a protection, and that those who do not please a ruffian gang, may learn in time that they must rely for safety on their own energies. Perhaps it is scarcely becoming in us to speak strongly on this subject, when the riots in our vicinity are remembered, which resulted in the destruction of so much property, and in the murder of the old man, James, and in that of Mr. Lamb, for which not even measures of investigation have been taken; but these acts were almost creditable when compared with the cowardly attack on the Ursuline Convent, occupied as it was with defenceless women and children."

Scalding Hogs. A gentleman of experience and observation desires us to make known for the benefit of farmers, a mode practised by him of scalding hogs. Instead of putting cold water or ashes into hot water, as is the general practice, he washes the hog in cold water previous to scalding it. It matters not how hot the water may be with which the hog is scalded, if cold water is first used in the way prescribed, the hair can be taken off with ease and neatness. No danger need be apprehended of the hair becoming set, as is often the case when this mode is not resorted to, owing to a particular temperature of the water.

The gentleman who communicated to us this mode, says he has practised it for more than twenty years, and has not, during that time, experienced any difficulty in scalding hogs.

In dressing a young pig for roasting, he first dips it in cold water and then in hot, by which process he is enabled to remove the hair with the least possible trouble.—[Wyoming Herald.]

COUNTY OF OXFORD
To ABEL GIBSON, Dr.
For Services as County Commissioner.

Nov. 5. To travel from Brownfield to Bridgton, on Petition of Samuel Andrews & others, 20 mil s. 2,00
6. To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on sd. Pt. 12,00
To travel home, 20 miles. 2,00
12. To travel from Brownfield to Kingfield on Petition of Charles Dolbier and others, in Somerset County, 110 miles. 11,00
13. Met the Co. Commissioners of said County and found their Notices not legal and adjourned 1 day. 3,00
16. To travel home 110 miles. 1,00
Dec. 6. To travel from Brownfield to Waterford on Petition of Caleb Stevens and others, 26 miles. 2,60
6. To 2 days viewing and hearing the parties. 6,00
7. To travel home 32 miles. 3,20
\$52,60

ABEL GIBSON.
OXFORD, ss : January 30th, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
TIMO. J. CARTER, Co. Atto.

COUNTY OF OXFORD
To JAMES STARR, Dr.
For Services as County Commissioner.

1833. Nov. 5. To travel from Jay to Bridgton, on Notice from Cumberland Co. Com'r's on petition of Samuel Andrews and als. 50 miles. 5,00
To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on sd. Pt. 12,00
To travel from Col. Navers in Sweden home, 50 miles. 5,00
To one day making a return and plan of the location of said road. 3,00
To one day making return of adjudication on petition of L. Bailey and Is. K. Fuller, als. T. Merrill and als. 3,00
19. To travel from Jay to Kingfield Village on notice from Somerset Co. Com'r's on Pet. of Charles Dolbier and als. and back to Jay, 88 miles. 8,80
To one day on said petition. 3,00
20. To travel from Jay to Cheney's Mills, Livermore, on notice from Kennebec Co. Com'r's on Pet. of Sam'l Morrison and als. and back to Jay, 7 miles. 7,00
To 1-2 day with said Com'r's on said Pt. and adjourned. 1,50
26. To travel on said Pt. to Livermore on the adjournment, 3

1-2 miles. 35
To 5 days viewing, hearing the parties on said petition. 15,00
To travel from Wayne home on said Pt., 18 miles. 1,30
D. c. 5. To travel from Jay to Waterford on Caleb Stevens and als. Pt., 41 miles. 4,10
To 2 days on joint view with Cumb. Co. Com'r's on sd Pt. To travel from Harrison Village home on sd Pt. 49 miles. 4,90
To making a joint return of dogs on said Pt. 1-2 day. 1,50
1834. May 5. To travel from Jay to Denmark on Parson Pingree's and als. Pt. 120 miles home. 12,00
To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on sd Pt. 12,00
To one day making return & plan of location. 3,00
To travel from Fryeburg on notice from Cumberland County Com'r's on Pt. of Inhabitants of Bridgton, & home, 124 miles. 12,40
To 6 days in joint view, making plan of view, and hearing parties and adjudication. 18,00
To 1-2 day making a joint return of adjudication. 1,50
June 13. To travel from Jay to Paris on Asaph Kittridge's and als. Pt. and home 60 miles. 6,00
To 1 day on said Petition. 1,50
16. To travel from Jay to Thayer's in Paris on Sam'l F. Brown & als. Pt. 27 miles. 2,70
To 1 day viewing on said Pt. 3,00
To 1 day writing notices to Cumberland and Kennebec Com'r's as to time of view. 3,00
To Stationary used in Com'r's business. 1,00
151,25

The above account is true as to time charged and distance traveled according to my best knowledge and belief. JAMES STARR.

Oxford, ss : June 19, 1834.

Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD
To ABEL GIBSON, Dr.

1834. May 7. To travel from Brownfield to Denmark on Pt. of Parson Pingree and others 10 miles. 1,00
8. To 2 days viewing and hearing the parties. 6,00
Adjourned to the 15th. Travel home, 10 miles. 1,00
9. To travel from Brownfield to Fryeburg 2-1/2 miles, on Pt. of John Pearley, Sam'l Farnsworth, and Asa Ingalls in behalf of the Inhabitants of Bridgton. 35
10. To 2 days viewing from Fryeburg to Bridgton. 6,00
12. To travel home & back to Bridgton Centre, 32 miles. 3,20
16. To 3 days viewing different routes from Bridgton back to Fryeburg, and hearing the parties. 9,00
To travel home, 8-1/2 miles. 35
On Pt. of Parson Pingree and others 15. To travel to said Pingree's in Denmark, 10 miles. 1,00
16. To 2 days locating. 6,00
To travel home, 10 miles. 1,00
June 12. To travel from Brownfield to Col. Eben'r Rawson's in Paris on Pt. of Asaph Kittridge and others, 38 miles. 3,80
13. To 1-2 day attendance on said petition. 1,50
To travel home, 38 miles. 3,80
To travel from Brownfield to Mr. Thayer's in Paris on Petition of Sam'l F. Brown and others 38 miles. 3,80
16. To 1 day attendance and adj. 3,00
\$50,70

The above account is true as to time charged and distance traveled according to my best knowledge and belief. ABEL GIBSON.

Oxford, ss : June 19, 1834.

Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD
To JOB PRINCE, Dr.

For Services as County Commissioner.

1834. May 5. To travel from Turner to Denmark on petition of Parson Pingree and others, 47 miles. 4,70
To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 12,00
To travel home, 47 miles. 4,70
To travel to Fryeburg and home on petition of the Inhabitants of Bridgton on joint view with Cumberland Com'r's 98 miles. 9,80
To 6 days viewing, hearing the parties, making plans and adjudicating on said petition. 18,00
June 13. To travel from Turner to Paris and home on petition of Asaph Kittridge and others 34 miles. 3,40
To 1-2 day on said petition. 1,50
16. To travel from Turner to Paris on petition of Sam'l F. Brown and als. 14 miles. 1,40
To 1 day viewing on said Pt. 3,00
\$56,50

The above account is true as to time charged

and distance traveled according to my best knowledge and belief. JOB PRINCE.
OXFORD, ss : June 19, 1834.

Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD
To MOSES MASON JR., Dr.

1833. Nov. 9. To travel from Bethel to Bridgton, 25 miles. 2,50
To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating a road on the Pt. of Sam'l Andrews & others. 12,00
To travel from Sweden to Bethel 26 miles. 2,00
16. To travel from Bethel to Kingfield & back to Bethel 164 miles. 16,40
To one day attendance on the Pet. of Dolbier and others. 3,00
Dec. 2. To travel to Samuel Memsons in Livermore, 50 miles. 5,00
To 4 days viewing and hearing the parties. 12,00
To travel from said Memsons to Bethel. 5,00
\$58,50

MOSES MASON JR.

OXFORD, ss : August 22, 1834.

Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD
To JAMES STARR, Dr.

For Services as County Commissioner.

1834. July 4. To 1 day making returns and plan of Roads. 3,00
On Pet. of Sam'l E. Spring & als. 17,00
Aug. 26. Travel from Jay to Brownfield Centre, 70 miles. 7,00
To viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 9,00
On Pet. of Stephen Rounds and others, 14 miles. 1,40
Sept. 2. To travel from Turner to Brownfield home on pet. of Robert Goodnow and others, 10 miles. 1,00
To viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 9,00
On Pet. of Robert Goodnow and others, 14 miles. 1,00
Sept. 12. Travel from Jay to Asa Francis' Livermore, 9 miles. 9,00
To 2 days on part of the road lying in Livermore. 6,00
Travel from Abijah Child's in Livermore home, 6 miles. 6,00
On Pet. of Robert Goodnow and others, 14 miles. 1,00
Aug. 29. Travel from Brownfield centre to Eben'r Walkers in Brownfield, 6 miles. 6,00
To viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 9,00
Travel from Sam'l Greenlaw's in Brownfield home, 73 miles. 7,30
On Pet. of Robert Goodnow and others, 14 miles. 1,00
Sept. 12. Travel from Jay to Asa Francis' Livermore, 9 miles. 9,00
To 2 days on part of the road lying in Livermore. 6,00
Travel from Abijah Child's in Livermore home, 6 miles. 6,00
On Pet. of Robert Goodnow and others, 14 miles. 1,00
Sept. 15. Travel from home to North Turner Post Office, 13 miles. 1,00
To 3 days viewing, hearing the parties and making returns. 9,00
On Pet. of Asaph Kittridge and als. 18,00
18. Travel from Maj. Prince's in Turner to Col. Eben'r Rawson's in Paris, 17 miles. 1,70
To 2 days viewing (Pet. failed). 6,00
Travel from said Rawson's home 28 miles. 6,00
On Pet. of Geo. F. Richardson and als. 2,80
22. Travel from Jay to Moses Merrill's, Andover, 38 miles. 3,80
To 3 days viewing (Pet. failed). 9,00
Travel from said Merrill's home, 38 miles. 3,80
On Pet. of John Dodge and als. 3,80
Oct. 7. Travel from Jay to John Hankerson's Plantation No. 1,40 miles. 4,00
To 5 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 15,00
Pet. of Charles Dolbier & als. on joint view with Somerset Com'r's. 5,00
13. Travel from said John Hankerson's to Kingfield Village 20 miles. 2,00
To 6 days & a half, viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 19,50
Travel from Kingfield Village 40 miles. 4,00
On Pet. of Asaph Kittridge and als. 24. Travel from Jay to said Kittridge's in Paris, 23 miles. 2,30
To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 12,00
\$139,60

I certify on oath, that the above account is true as to the distance traveled, according to the best of my knowledge and belief, and true as to time charged. JAMES STARR.

Oxford, ss : October Term, 1834.

Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD
To ABEL GIBSON, Dr.

For Services as County Commissioner.

1834. May 5. To travel from Turner to Denmark on petition of Samuel E. Spring and others. 4,70
Aug. 27 & 28. To travel from Brownfield Centre 4 miles. 9,00
Sept. 1. To 3 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 12,00
To 10 miles travel. 4,70
On petition of Stephen Rounds and others. 1,00
To travel from home to Eben'r Walker's in Paris, 10 miles. 1,00
Aug. 30. To 2 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 12,00
To travel home, 12 miles. 6,00
On Pet. of Robert Goodnow and others. 1,00
To travel from Brownfield to Asa Francis in Livermore 60 miles. 6,00
Sept. 17. To 6 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 18,00
On Pet. of Asaph Kittridge and others. 1,00
To travel from Turner to Col. Rawson's in Paris and home on petition of Asaph Kittridge and others. 18,00
To 6 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 18,00
To travel home, 30 miles. 6,00
On Pet. of George F. Richardson and others. 1,00
To travel from Brownfield to Moses Merrill's in Andover, 50 miles. 5,00
24. To 3 days viewing (notice not complied with) 9,00
To travel home, 50 miles. 5,00
On Pet. of John Dodge and others. 1,00
To travel from Brownfield to John Hankerson's in Township No. 1, 1st Range 106 ms. 10,00
Oct. 12. To 5 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 15,00

The above account is true as to time charged

and distance traveled according to my best knowledge and belief. JOB PRINCE.
OXFORD, ss : October Term, 1834.

Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD
To JOB PRINCE, Dr.

For Services as County Commissioner.

1834. Aug. 26. To travel from Turner to Brownfield on pet. of Sam'l E. Spring & als. 57ms. 5,70
To 3 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 12,00
On Pet. of Eben'r Walker's on pet. of Stephen Rounds and others, 14 miles. 1,40
To viewing, hearing the parties and locating, on said petition 3 days. 9,00
To travel from Sam'l Greenlaw's in Brownfield home, 60 miles. 6,00
Sept. 12. To travel from Turner to Asa Francis' in Livermore on pet. of Robert Goodnow and others, 10 miles. 1,00
To viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 9,00
On Pet. of Abijah Charles' in Livermore home, 14 miles. 1,40
15. To travel from home to N. Turner Post Office, 7 miles. 7,00
To viewing, hearing the parties and making returns. 3,00
18. To travel from Turner to Col. Rawson's in Paris on pet. of Asaph Kittridge and others. 1,00
To viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 9,00
17. To viewing 3 days (petition failed) 4,50
To travel home, 17 miles. 4,50
22. To travel from Turner to Andover on pet. of George F. Richardson & als. 48 miles. 4,50
To viewing 3 days (petition failed) 4,50
To travel from Moses Merrill's in Andover home, 48 miles. 4,50
Oct. 7. To travel from Turner to John Hankerson's in No. 1, on pet. of John Dodge & als. 60 ms. 6,00
To viewing, hearing the parties and locating 4 days. 15,00
13. To travel from John Hankerson's in No. 1, on joint view with Somerset Com'r's. 2,00
To Kingfield on pet. of Asa Francis' in Livermore 9 miles. 6,00
To viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 6,00
Travel from Eben'r Walker's in Brownfield, 6 miles. 6,00
To viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 6,00
Travel from Abijah Child's in Livermore home, 6 miles. 6,00
On Pet. of Robert Goodnow and others, 14 miles. 1,00
Sept. 12. Travel from home to North Turner Post Office, 13 miles. 1,00
To 3 days viewing, hearing the parties and making returns. 9,00
On Pet. of Asaph Kittridge and als. 18,00
18. Travel from Maj. Prince's in Turner to Col. Eben'r Rawson's in Paris, 17 miles. 1,70
To 2 days viewing (Pet. failed). 6,00
Travel from said Rawson's home 28 miles. 6,00
On Pet. of Geo. F. Richardson and als. 2,80
22. Travel from Jay to Moses Merrill's, Andover, 38 miles. 3,80
To 3 days viewing (Pet. failed). 9,00
Travel from said Merrill's home, 38 miles. 3,80
On Pet. of John Dodge and als. 3,80
Oct. 7. Travel from Jay to John Hankerson's Plantation No. 1,40 miles. 4,00
To 5 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 15,00
Pet. of Charles Dolbier & als. on joint view with Somerset Com'r's. 5,00
13. Travel from said John Hankerson's to Kingfield Village 20 ms. 2,00
To 6 days & a half, viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 19,50
Travel from Kingfield Village 40 miles. 4,00
On Pet. of Asaph Kittridge and als. 24. Travel from Jay to said Kittridge's in Paris, 23 miles. 2,30
To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 12,00
\$132,90

I certify on oath that the above account is true as to distance traveled according to my best knowledge and belief, and true as to time charged. JOB PRINCE.

OXFORD, ss : Oct. Term, 1834.

Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD
To ABEL GIBSON, Dr.

For Services as County Commissioner.

1834. June 1. To travel from Turner to Denmark on petition of Parson Pingree and others. 4,70
Aug. 27 & 28. To travel from Brownfield Centre 4 miles. 9,00
Sept. 1. To 3 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 12,00
To 10 miles travel. 4,70
On petition of Stephen Rounds and others. 1,00
To travel from home to Eben'r Walker's in Paris, 10 miles. 1,00
Aug. 30. To 2 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 12,00
To travel home, 12 miles. 6,00
On Pet. of Robert Goodnow and others. 1,00
To travel from Brownfield to Asa Francis in Livermore 60 miles. 6,00
Sept. 17. To 6 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 18,00
On Pet. of Asaph Kittridge and others. 1,00
To travel from Turner to Col. Rawson's in Paris and home on petition of Asaph Kittridge and others. 18,00
To 6 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 18,00
To travel home, 30 miles. 6,00
On Pet. of John Dodge and others. 1,00
To travel from Brownfield to John Hankerson's in Township No. 1, 1st Range 106 ms. 10,00
Oct.

**ISSUE
MISSING**

**ISSUE
MISSING**